W:\STULL\LUMINENT\PLD\LP Reply.wpd

## this reply memorandum in support of his motion for appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel, and in reply to Southern's Opposition to Certain Plaintiffs' Motions for Appointment as Lead Plaintiff and Approval of its [sic] Selection of Lead Counsel ("Southern's Opposition).<sup>1</sup> For the reasons outlined below, and in his moving and opposition papers, Mr. Kornfeld respectfully requests this Court appoint him Lead Plaintiff and appoint his selection of counsel as Co-Lead Counsel for the putative plaintiff Class.

Proposed Lead Plaintiff William F. Kornfeld, Jr. (hereinafter "Kornfeld") hereby submits

## I. ARGUMENT

Mr. Kornfeld is the lead plaintiff applicant with the largest interest in this litigation, who also meets the qualifications to serve as lead plaintiff.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, of the six pending lead plaintiff applications, only Southern to filed an Opposition to Mr. Kornfeld's Motion. However, contrary to Southern's Opposition, Mr. Kornfeld is the individual investor with the largest losses who also satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 because Southern Improvement may be subject to unique defenses and therefore lacks typicality. *See In re Cavanaugh*, 306 F.3d 726, 729-30 (9th Cir. 2002), *citing* 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I). Moreover, unlike Southern's selected counsel, Mr. Kornfeld's selected proposed lead counsel has no conflicts with their client, as further discussed below. Accordingly, Mr. Kornfeld should be appointed lead plaintiff and his selected counsel should be appointed lead counsel.

As outlined in Mr. Kornfeld's Opposition, Southern is atypical because, according to the certification submitted on behalf of Southern Improvement, Southern Improvement sold certain

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In addition to Mr. Kornfeld, motions for appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel were also filed by (i) Southern Improvement Company ("Southern Improvement"), Allen Dayton and VSA, Inc. ("VSA") (collectively referring to themselves as "Southern" in their Opposition papers); (ii) Joel Sharenow, Bradley Burns and Rajivi Kumar Prasad; (iii) State-Boston Retirement System and Norfolk County Retirement System; (iv) Ronald Larson; and (v) District No. 9, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers Pension Trust ("District No.9"). District No. 9 withdrew its application for appointment of lead plaintiff/lead counsel on November 6, 2007.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> While Southern purports to have the largest losses, for the reasons outlined herein, Southern should not be appointed lead plaintiff.

Luminent Mortgage Capital, Inc. ("Luminent") call options. See Exhibit ("Exh.") 1 to the
Declaration of David C. Harrison in Support of Motion by Southern for Appointment as Lead
Plaintiff and Approval of Their Selection of Lead Counsel ("Harrison Decl.). <sup>3</sup> As outlined in Mr.
Kornfeld's Opposition, Southern Improvement's selling of those call options during the Class
Period was a form of hedging against a decline in the price of Luminent's stock price. These
hedging activities make Southern Improvement an atypical proposed lead plaintiff applicant because
it calls into question Southern Improvement's ability to adequately represent the interests of a class
of investors. See Camden Asset Mgmt., L.P. v. Sunbeam Corp., 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11022 at
*48 (S.D. Fl. 2001); Silverstein v. Digital Equipment Corp., 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6333 (D. Mass.
1990). To address these issues more completely, Mr. Kornfeld requested relevant documentation
from Southern, a request which Southern refused. See Bishop Declaration in Support of William F.
Kornfeld, Jr.'s Opposition to Competing Motions for Appointment of Lead Plaintiff and Lead
Counsel Exhs. 1 and 2.

In addition, a conflict exists between Southern Improvement, the proposed Class and Southern Improvement's proposed lead counsel, Lowey Dannenberg Bemporad Selinger & Cohen, P.C. According to Southern Improvement's certification, Southern Improvement adopted the allegations contained in the complaint filed in *Metzger v. Luminent Mortgage, Inc.*, *et al.*, 07-CV-4686 (PJH). *See* Harrison Decl. Exh. 1 at ¶3. According to the *Metzger* Complaint for Violations of the Securities Laws, filed on September 11, 2007, *Metzger* "is a securities fraud class action on behalf of all purchasers of publicly traded securities of Luminent between October 10, 2006 and August 6, 2007, inclusive (the "Class Period"), against Luminent and certain of its officers and directors for violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("1934 Act"). *See Metzger v. Luminent, et al.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. C 07-04686 (PJH) [now consolidated into this consolidated action], Docket No. 1, ¶1 at 1:10-13.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In a chart annexed to Southern Improvement's Certification, signed by Allen Dayton on October 5, 2007, Dayton, through Southern Improvement, repeatedly sold "Call" Options between June 26, 2007 through August 3, 2007.

20

22

25

However, according to the chart of transactions attached to Southern Improvement's certification, in addition to selling call options during the Class Period, between June 28, 2007 and July 12, 2007, Southern Improvement sold "put" options. The selling of put options is a transaction in Luminent securities which is not included within the Class Period definition adopted by Southern. A put option is a contract that grants the holder the right to sell a specific number of shares of a stock by a date certain at a specified price. See John Downes & Jordan Elliot Goodman, Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms (Barron's Financial Guides, 4th ed., 1995). Notably, therefore, while the seller of a put option may be damaged under the securities laws, that seller has not engaged in a purchase, they have engaged in a sale.<sup>4</sup> As a result, the losses allegedly incurred by Southern Improvement as a result of their sale of put options between June 28, 2007 and July 12, 2007, are not part of this litigation.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, Southern Improvement has a conflict with not only their counsel but the purported Class as a whole because, by having Southern Improvement adopt a class period which only included "purchasers," Southern Improvement's counsel has abandoned its claims for losses occurring from its sale of put options. As a result, Southern Improvement is, again, atypical and should not be appointed lead plaintiff.

If, however, this Court is not prepared to deny Southern's application in its entirety, contrary to Southern's Opposition, this Court should permit discovery into Southern's trading activity. See Southern Opposition, n.15 at 10:24-27; see also Brown v. Biogen IDEC, Inc., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19350 at \*6 (D. Mass. 2005) (ordering discovery of a proposed lead plaintiff) (citing 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a) (3) (B)). Moreover, this Court should allow discovery assuring that Southern understands that its counsel has abandoned certain of its claimed losses because those losses are outside the Class Period definition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Tellingly, the seller of a put option is generally damaged after the Class Period when the stock price has decreased and the holder of the note calls for the put option seller to make good on their contract. See, e.g., Harrison Decl. Exh. 1, page 37 of 95.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> In addition, none of the class period definitions included in the other complaints filed against Luminent and consolidated into this action includes the sale of put options. Order Consolidated Cases, N.D. Cal. Case No. 07-04073 (PJH), Docket No. 51, filed October 10, 2007.

## II. **CONCLUSION**

For all the foregoing reasons, Mr. Kornfeld respectfully renews his request that this Court appoint him as Lead Plaintiff pursuant to Section 21D(a)(3)(B) of the 1934 Act, and approve his choice of Stull, Stull & Brody and Abraham, Fruchter & Twersky, LLP as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class pursuant to Section 21D(a)(3)(B)(v) of the 1934 Act.<sup>6</sup>

Dated: November 7, 2007 Patrice L. Bishop

7

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

STULL, STULL & BRODY

Patrice L. Bishop 10940 Wilshire Boulevard

**Suite 2300** 

Los Angeles, CA 90024 Tel: (310) 209-2468 Fax: (310) 209-2087

Jules Brody Howard T. Longman STULL, STULL & BRODY

6 East 45th Street New York, NY 10017 Tel: (212) 687-7230 (212) 490-2022 Fax:

Jeffrey S. Abraham Lawrence D. Levit

ABRAHAM, FRUCHTER & TWERSKY, LLP One Penn Plaza, Suite 2805

New York, NY 10119 Tel: (212) 279-5050 (212) 279-3655 Fax:

Counsel for Movant and Proposed Lead Counsel for the Class

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> If this Court is inclined to grant the application of any other proposed lead plaintiff over Mr. Kornfeld, Mr. Kornfeld respectfully requests this Court reconsider his application if that lead plaintiff becomes unable to fulfill its duties on behalf of the purported Class.

KORNFELD, JR.'S REPLY MEMO ISO HIS MTN FOR APPT OF LEAD PLTF & LEAD COUNSEL CASE NO. C-07-4140 PJH
W:\STULL\LUMINENT\PLD\LP Reply.wpd

SF-DocCal@hewm.com

28

1 I further certify that I served a copy(ies) of the above document(s) on the following non-CM/ECF participant(s) by depositing a copy(ies) in the United States mail, first-class postage 2 prepaid, as follows: 3 Marc C. Gardy Sherrie R. Savett GARDY & NOTIS, LLP Arthur Stock 440 Sylvan Avenue 4 Jeffrey L. Osterwise Suite 110 BERĞER & MONTAGUE, P.C. 5 1622 Locust Street Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632 (201) 567-7377 Philadelphia, PA 19103 Tel: (201) 457-7337 (215) 875-3000 6 Fax: Tel: Fax: (215) 875-4604 7 Email: ssavett@bm.net **Counsel for Plaintiff Joseph Leone** astock@bm.net 8 Shawn A. Williams josterwise@bm.net COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & **ROBBINS LLP** Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Action, 100 Pine Street Allen M. Metzger 10 **Suite 2600** San Francisco, CA 94111 Christopher J. Keller (415) 288-4545 Andrei V. Rado 11 Tel: (415) 288-4534 Fax: Alan I. Ellman LABATON SUCHAROW LLP 12 Email: shawnw@csgrr.com 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005 13 Counsel for Plaintiffs in Related Actions, Rosenbaum Capital LLC and Elliott (212) 907-0700 Tel: 14 **Greenberg and Movant Charles Bregenzer** Fax: (212) 818-0477 15 Evan J. Smith **Counsel for Movants State-Boston BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC Retirement System and Norfolk County** Two Bala Plaza 16 **Retirement System** Suite 602 17 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 Alan R. Plutzik, Of Counsel Tel: (610) 667-6200 L. Timothy Fisher, Of Counsel (610) 667-9029 SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY TOPAZ & 18 Fax: KESSLER, LLP 19 Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Action, 2125 Oak Grove Road **PEM Resources LP** Suite 120 20 Walnut Creek, CA 94598 (925) 945 0770 John J. Soroko Tel: 21 **DUANE MORRIS LLP** Fax: (925) 945-8792 30 South 17th Street Email: aplutzik@bramsonplutzik.com 22 Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196 ltfisher@bramsonplutzik.com Tel: (215) 979-1000 23 (215) 979-1020 Richard A. Maniskas Fax: D. Seamus Kaskela 24 Counsel for Defendants S. Trezevant SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY TOPAZ & Moore, Jr. and Christopher J. Zyda KESSLER, LLP 25 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087 (610) 667-7706 26 Tel: (610) 667-7056 Fax: 27 Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Action, 28 PEM Resources LP and Movant Ronald Larson

KORNFELD, JR.'S REPLY MEMO ISO HIS MTN FOR APPT OF LEAD PLTF & LEAD COUNSEL CASE NO. C-07-4140 PJH
W:\STULL\LUMINENT\PLD\LP Reply.wpd

Document 105

Filed 11/07/2007

Page 8 of 8

Case 3:07-cv-04073-PJH

CASE NO. C-07-4140 PJH
W:\STULL\LUMINENT\PLD\LP Reply.wpd